REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16-27 are amended herein and new claim 28 is added. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-28 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following: U.S. Patent No. 5,978,828 (Greer), U.S. Patent No. 6,259,442 (Britt), U.S. Patent No. 5,978,807 (Mano) and U.S. Patent No. 6,055,570 (Nielson).

The Examiner maintains the comparison of the Greer system providing notification of a content change of a web page based on user specified settings with the claimed automatic notification method and system. In Greer, the browser enhancement (104) in the client memory element (26) provides a setup window with user assignable settings for retrieving update information of a web page and downloads the web page when a current revision minus the last revision is greater than or equal to the value specified by the user (see, col. 3, lines 14-23 and col. 7, lines 20-32). That is, Greer is limited to notifications regarding changes to web pages for which the user wants to receive notifications, and thus, only provides update notifications for web pages the user has individually assigned settings.

Britt is directed to automatically downloading software upgrades over a satellite link to a client without requiring interaction with a user. However, Britt is limited to downloads based on user subscription in relation to set-top boxes and only when upgrades are available (see, col. 3, lines 47-55 and col. 7, lines 20-35).

The Examiner relies on Nielson as teaching automatically storing, in the server system, an access log with respect to a home page arbitrarily accessed by the client system. However, Nielson is directed to a *subscriber* based update service for which a user registers by specifying URLs of sites the user wants monitored for changes. As shown in Fig. 5, when the "Add New Site" button (500) is selected, the user is prompted to enter (manually) the URL of the site that the user wants monitored (see also, col. 5, lines 21-40 and corresponding text of Fig. 5). As such, Nielson is limited to monitoring a change in the contents of the page which has been *specified by the user* in advance.

As explicitly stated in the Abstract of Nielson, "The user can modify the list of information sources to be monitored by the updated monitor service" (see, Abstract). Nielson also explicitly states:

> "The invention is also related to a method of providing information to one or more users about changes in content of information stored on one or more network servers, **registering a user together with a list of network addresses of information the user desires to monitor for change in a database**, and subscribing to a change notification service provided by a server on which a network address is located, if one is provided" (emphasis added).

(see, col. 2, lines 53-58 of Nielson).

As also shown in Fig. 3, the user interface (user operation screen) has "Add New site", "Remove Site", "Show All Subscribed Sites", etc., as the items to be specified by the user (see also, corresponding text of Fig. 3). Therefore, it is clear that the user is required to add or delete a desired site according to the system of Nielson.

Similar to Greer and Nielson, Mano requires a user to manually specify web page information at a specified Internet address downloading a web page (see, col. 2, lines 38-44).

The claimed system and method provide a mechanism for causing users to re-access previously accessed data including homepages the users may not have indicated an interest in by "automatically" providing a notification to the users. In particular, the users are not required to specify a particular homepage in advance. When the user arbitrarily accesses a homepage, the access log with respect to the homepage is automatically stored in the server system. Then, the server system automatically transmits a notification to the user which includes information for inducing the user to the homepage when a predetermined condition is satisfied with reference to a point in time when the user last accessed the homepage.

Independent claim 1 recites, "automatically storing **an access log** with respect to a homepage... **in response to an access to the homepage**" and "automatically creating in the server system, with respect to the client system, a notification which includes information **identifying contents of the homepage previously accessed** for inducing the client system **to re-access** the homepage when a predetermined condition is satisfied" (emphasis added). Claim 1 further recites, "automatically transmitting the notification, where the predetermined condition is set by the server system independent of the client system." Independent claims 6, 11 and 16-20 recite similar features.

Claims 21 and 22 recite, "automatically storing an access log with respect to a homepage" including "independent of a store request via the client system" (claim 21) and "in response to an access to the homepage" (claim 22) and sending "information identifying contents of the homepage previously accessed" to attract a client system to re-access the homepage.

Independent claims 23-25 recite that the access log is stored, "**as a direct result of an access** to the homepage via the client system" (Claim 23) and "**independent of a request** to store information of the homepage from the client system" (claim 24 and 25) (emphasis added).

Claim 25 further recites that the notification includes "**advertisement information** related to the homepage" and "automatically sending the notification to the client system when the stored homepage information and the contents of the homepage are different in accordance with a predetermined condition set by a server system independent of the client system" (emphasis added).

Claim 26 recites, "automatically storing an access log with respect to a homepage [as] a result of an access to the homepage" and "allowing **a homepage provider** to create a notification identifying contents of the homepage previously accessed for inducing re-access to the homepage and automatically transmitting the notification to the client system when a condition set by the homepage provider is met" (emphasis added).

Similarly, claim 27 recites, "allowing the homepage provider to create a notification identifying contents of the homepage previously accessed, upon a first access to the homepage via the client system", "transmitting the notification **when a condition set by the homepage provider... prior to said homepage being accessed via the client system**" is met and executing the second access "responsive to the transmitted notification" (emphasis added)

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above discussed of the independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16-27.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited claim 4, the access inducing method includes, "urging the client system to input user information" and "said notification being made based on the user information" (see also, claims 9 and 14). The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of claims 4, 9 and 14.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 28 has been added to recite, "capturing information of a homepage responsive to a user accessing the homepage, said information being captured without requiring a designation of said information by the user." New claim 28 further recites, "sending a notification independent of a browser used to access the homepage when a condition specified independently of the client system is met.'"

The cited references do not teach or suggest the above discussed features of claim 28 including "capturing information of a homepage... without requiring a designation of said information by the user" and "sending a notification independent of a browser used to access the homepage when a condition specified independently of the client system is met", as recited in claim 28.

It is submitted that new claim 28 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS:

Information Disclosure Statements were filed on August 31, 2006 and November 28, 2006. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider documents forwarded therewith.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 01/29/2007

By: Temnit Afework

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202